THE

# "HINDU MESSAGE"

A Weekly Review of Indian and World-Problems from the Hindu Standpoint.

**Editors: K. Sundararama Aiyar M.A., & T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A.**

VOL. 1.] THURSDAY JANUARY 17, 1918. [No. 13.

The **Hindu Message** stands for

(1) The Maintenance of British supremacy with self-government for India,

(2) Co-operation with the different communities of India without prejudice to Hindu Dharma,

(3) Education of the Hindus as an integral part of the Indian Nation,

(4) Advancement of Material prosperity on a spiritual basis and

(5) Dissemination of pure Hindu Culture.

Annual Subscription Rs. 6 only.

For *bona fide* students Rs. 3 only.

Single copy As. 2 only.

*All business communications and remittances to be addressed to the Manager and all literary contributions and books for Review to be addressed to the Editor*, THE HINDU MESSAGE, ***Srirangam.***

## A Vision Of India.

### THE GHATS.

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

Queen India! In thy sovereign right hand lies
The range of Sahya hills as arrow bright
And in Thy left hand like a bow of might
The eastern hills in sunlit radiance rise
In Sahya range a gem above all price
Fair Chitrakuta shines in summer light
Where Sita and her lord in blessed sight
Of one another found Loves' Paradise.
And in the eastern range of hills there shine
Like praying Earth's uplifted offerings
A hundred shrines with soaring golden towers
Where in oblivion of all thoughts of thine
And mine, the priests and ploughman poor and kings
As equals met as God's devoted lovers.

The Hindu Message

THURSDAY EVENING 17, JAN. 1918.

## Hindu Society Always One Politically Organised.

That there have always been Non-Caste men within the pale of Hindu Society and certain inequalities of religious status or duty is no proof that that society had never reached the stage of free association of citizens in a civil or political organisation,—that it was, and still is, in the primary stage of social regimentation or in the secondary stage of a purely social constitution with various forms of minor association comprised within it. Some who do not sympathise with our present aspirations point to the two circumstances above mentioned to prove that Hindu Society is not and has never sufficiently advanced to receive a political constitution similar to that now existing in the great centres of European civilisation. Others—and these are mainly our social radicals and revolutionalists—hold, like the Editor of "The Modern Review" in a recent number, that "we must be truly democratic in our social relations," and that an upholder of our caste-system and its Dharmas, varying according to the religious position of the majority in each sub-division of society, is not, and never can be a Home Ruler." But it is evident that all these schools of political opinion conveniently forget the fact mentioned by a distinguished scientific writer—the late Grant Allen that "even in the most English portions of England,—a British race which is not English survives in considerable numbers,"—that "in modern England, dark, curly hair, and black eyes are to be found in half of the existing population." These facts show that, as a result of the coming together of the Saxons and Danes with the earlier Celtic people, the population of England is no longer the light-haired and blue-eyed people they once were like the people now inhabiting various parts of Norway and Sweden, and are, therefore, far from being an absolutely homogeneous people. Nor is it correct to say that, even in the politically advanced states of the world, there is absolute equality of civil status and rights among all their citizens and populations. For, if we look, for instance, to the conditions prevailing in the United States, we cannot fail to notice that the Negroes and the Red Indians are subject to various social, legal, or political disabilities.

What, then, are the true tests to show that a community has reached the advanced condition of a civil or political organisation fitting it for the exercise of the functions and prerogatives of self-government? A distinguished Western writer says :—"The State in its political character enters on the stage of constitutional development, and there is a great multiplication of subordinate associations." We proceed to consider whether Hindu society, ancient or present, can be allowed to satisfy these conditions and tests.

Our Rishis have declared in their Smritis the various constitutional and social changes suited to different times and stages of development in India. It is true at the same time that the Dharmas declared by them are eternal

injunctions of Heaven having a spiritual purpose and value,—not mere laws in the Western sense of being declared by the will of an absolute ruler or parliamentary assembly; but this difference does not affect the truth of our contention. Jurists like the late Sir Henry Sumner Maine have, indeed, suggested a similarity between our Smriti rules and regulations and the *Responsa Prudentum* of Roman lawyers. But the suggestion betrays a very superficial view of the matter and an ignorance of the exact conditions under which the injunctions and laws of our Rishis were declared or carried out. In Rome, it was purely a matter of administrative convenience whether the rules of law declared by the men learned in the law were adopted in the working of the mechanism of law or administration. But in India the Rishis never failed to command the respect due to their omniscience, and hence their declarations at Parishads were universally accepted both by the sovereign or ruler and by his subjects as the very quintessence of divine wisdom revealed to them in their state of suprasensuous experience and as the only available means enjoined and ordained by God for the gaining of the bliss of eternal spiritual peace and freedom. It is by these Smritis that the safety of his throne was assured to the sovereign and his successors in the royal line, while also provision was made for a progressive or successive change in the law and constitution in accordance with the physical or social change constituting the society in its natural environment.

While some modern minds here and in the West are, or may be inclined to allow that there is a considerable, or at least a fair, amount of truth in the representation above given of the growth and development of the machinery of the Hindu constitution in the early or middle age of Hindu history, all Western or Westernised minds will be totally disinclined to admit the existence in Hindu Society of the conception of freedom as determining the right of uniting into organised associations for the promotion of economic, ethical, or other aims. Their minds, too, are completely obsessed by the idea that all excellence and all progress must be confined to the Western world. They are also too indolent, or too disinclined, to devote their energies to the comprehension of Indian social phenomena, past and present. The strangeness of those phenomena and their more or less rapid disappearance or transformation in every part of India under the revolutionary blows levelled at them from all quarters within the last half-a-century, also account for the diversity of views formed of them or for the unfavourable opinion prevailing in various quarters from which we may expect the sober and ripe voice of responsible common sense and reason.

While we are prepared to concede that our Hindu associations in the early or middle age may not have attained to the public importance, or adopted the purposive methods, characteristic of the associations subordinate to the state of which students of European history are familiar, we have no doubt that the economic and ethical associations known as the village communities possessed recognised privileges of high value and importance, and that they contributed to the welfare and happiness of the people and enabled them to realise their mutual

responsibilities and combine together to advance the common welfare. The Indian village was not only a self-sufficing and self-governing community, but it also entered into relations with the supreme or provincial government not only for purposes of taxation, but for all important purposes of legislation, administration, justice, and military organisation. The existence of the great Hindu empires—of the Maurya, the Gupta, the Vijayanagar, and the Mahratta empires—is itself sufficient, to prove the bare truth of the above statement. These empires have also left behind them records of various kinds from which the character of both local and imperial Hindu government is being gradually built up and laid bare by Indian students and scholars trained in the modern scientific methods of historical study. Many misconceptions regarding the conditions of administration in ancient and mediaeval India have already been overthrown. Not only did the Indian villages produce enough for their daily and periodical wants, decided their own disputes, provided for their internal peace, and adopted a form of representative government suited to their size and wants, but they entered into various relations of importance with their rulers, local and imperial. It is absurd to assume that there was no judicial machinery to decide disputes between the inhabitants of various villages, or that the villages were completely isolated from each other, or that they were not brought under a common military organisation for the purpose of defence against the foreign invader or the suppression of internal disturbances or rebellions,—simply because there was a Moslem conquest, and a Moslem domination established with varying powers of suzerainty over different parts of the Indian continent. It would be equally just and equally reasonable to assume that, because British dominion has now been established, there was in the Moghul empire no judicial machinery or military organisation competent to fulfil the purposes for which they exist in all states.

Moreover the caste system was itself a bond of unity between different villages, districts, provinces and states, and it brought together the inhabitants belonging to different castes in different parts of the state into relations of amity and unity with each other. Religion which is the subject of paramount interest and importance to Indians was ever an inspiration to unity of aim and mutual influence between all parts of India. Each great religious movement, as it arose, spread over all parts of India gaining adherents and uniting them into a more or less compact body under common leaders and with a system of common spiritual ministration and administration. Numerous fresh divisions and sub-divisions of society and fresh associations of individuals constantly came into existence, and all of them entered into relations of diverse kinds with the central power, claiming protection and securing its patronage. To say that the different castes, sections or sects or sub-sections or sub-sects in Hindu society enjoyed no hope of freedom or power of self-control and self-culture under Hindu rule, and that they were merely slaves driven by the tyrannic sceptre of a theocratic king claiming to be the uncontrolled vice-gerent of a Supreme Unknown beyond the universe of matter is simply to speak at random and without recognising any known

laws of thought or intelligent speech, and therefore deserves no reply. The truth, on the other hand, is that the Hindu sovereign himself had to obey those unalterable and eternal rules of Dharma which were given out by the seers and sages who were themselves free from all bondage to matter and whose divinely-appointed mission was to bring into the world that ordered freedom which is the one means to secure to the Holy People, and through them to the rest of humanity the attainment of the goal of eternal freedom.

---

## "The Brahmin Vakil Oligarchy of Home Rulers."

The *Madras Mail* which, for its own purposes, has taken under its protection a small section of the Non-Brahmin Community, asserts the existence of a purely imaginary "Brahmin Vakil Oligarchy of Home Rulers" (December 4th, 1917), and goes on to enumerate its four leading characteristics as follows :—(1) it interferes in all matters, *i.e.*, those relating to political, social, and religious life ; (2) it is exclusive, as forming a community bound by the caste tie ; (3) it favours men belonging to its own caste ; (4) it has long enjoyed ascendancy and resents the intrusion of men of other communities. Our contempoary concludes by asserting that the alternative before the present generation is "freedom in all essentials under British rule and tyranny under the rule of one Indian minority."

We have rarely seen such a mass of selfishness, bigotry, and blatant disregard for realities compressed within so small a compass as the above. We shall first deal with the points mentioned one after another. *Firstly*, The Brahmin Vakils, as such, have no recognised power to interfere in the political, social, and religious life of the land. Even as Brahmins, they can only take part in political, religious and social life exactly as other Hindus —or even Non-Hindus—can do so. Further more, such Hindu religious life as there is has got connected with the home and the temple ; and here the Brahmin Vakil, neither as a Vakil nor even as a Brahmin, has any special privilege of interference not possessed by others. *Secondly*, there is little or no caste tie among the three sub-sects of Brahmins. Each belongs to a different religious organisation ; and one of them—the Smarthas—have no organisation at all which serves to bring them socially together. Each has a special religious literature of its own, the object of which is to give an interpretation of the Vedas, &c., which is peculiar to itself. Each, too, has its own tradition and customary observances, and has no interdining or intermarriage with the other sections. *Thirdly*, numerous individuals belonging to any of these sub-castes or sub-sects are often known to lie in wait for opportunities of injuring those belonging to other sects or sections, and they have rarely or never helped each other except for a consideration,—which, perhaps, is a characteristic not specially Brahminical, but largely human, *i.e.*, known to belong to the baser sort of human nature all over the world. "The strong caste tie between Brahmin and Brahmin" which our contemporary speaks of is simply conspicuous by its absence. *Fourthly*, it is nearly a century at least since power passed from the Hindu Kings to the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy, and

the Brahmin Vakils have only been able, in most cases, to keep the wolf from the door by hard work. A few Vakils—one in fifty or a hundred—may make a fortune, but they are the exceptions only.

Nor is it right to say that the Brahmins as a class or caste form a powerful oligarchy. In the *first* place, they are not composed of a few powerful or noble families raised to power by the substitution of a board of magistrates or officials belonging to those families. No such board of Brahmins is in power anywhere in the land. All power in India belongs to the civilian bureaucracy, and this latter body selects the native officials who are to work under them. These officials are often Brahmins, but they are also often Non-Brahmins. Whether Brahmins or Non-Brahmins, their position is often the reverse of enviable, and we know cases of big and even famous Indian officials who have sometimes been forced to do the most shameful and even servile services to the bureaucratic godlets placed in power above them. It is a misuse of terms to call such a body of men by the name of oligarchy, simply because it serves, for the time being, the purposes of our Anglo-Indian Contemporary and the cause he seeks to serve. In the *second* place, an oligarchy has come into existence by limiting the franchise qualifying for citizenship, either by excluding the people who have been conquered in war, or by laying down a high property qualification. In India, the Brahmins have neither been a conquering race, nor a rich propertied class. Even supposing they were, either their power fell long ago with the Hindu Kings whom the East India Company supplanted, and so they have not the power to exclude the Non-Brahmin castes from the franchise, nor to restrict the franchise in such a manner that all voting power may be confined to themselves. In Modern India, there is yet no voting power worth the name, nor is it confined to the Brahmins in such a manner as to constitute them into an oligarchy with power to bend the power and resources of the state for their own advancement or resources.

It might be said in reply that what is meant is that, by the Congress scheme of self-government, the Brahmins purpose to raise themselves into the position of a powerful oligarchy of the kind contemplated by the powerful imagination of our Anglo-Indian Contemporary. But this is a manifest absurdity. For, the Congress is now irrevocably committed to the system of communal representation. The Brahmin, thus, will be one only of several communities entitled to representation, and can only send, under the most favourable circumstances, a very infinitesimal fraction of the total strength of the members of our future Legislative Councils. It must be conceded to the credit of the Brahmin lawyers who have worked for the Congress cause that they have done so purely out of a desire that their country and people should rise to the status of a self-governing community and in an entire spirit of self-abnegation. Had they cared only for their own worldly advancement or ascendancy, they would surely have striven to perpetuate, the *status quo* and to maintain the Civil Service bureaucracy in continued possession of power. It is conceded and recognised on all hands that, under any scheme of self-

government—whether it amounts to Home Rule, or not—there can be no Brahmin oligarchy, except in the perturbed and malignant imagination of the Anglo-Indian journalist or bureaucrat and of the Non-Brahmin clique which they are using in order to defeat the cause of the Indian democracy of which the Brahmin caste has, throughout its past history, formed an integral part and with whose fortunes it will be closely linked, whether for good or for evil, during the eventful years and epochs of India's hopeful and eternal future.

---

## Notes and Comments.

Mrs. Besant, in her address as President of the recent Theosophical Convention, spoke as follows:— "Let the temples be thrown open to all the submerged who are Hindus. Do you think, that God worshipped in the temples, can be polluted by the touch of his own children. Not so thought Sri Rama who ate the fruit which the outcaste woman had tasted in order to be sure that it was sweet for his lips. Not so thought Sri Krishna who healed the lame flower-girl of the market-place." In the temples God is worshipped, but through images which are consecrated by saintly men who, in creating a spiritual atmosphere round the images through the introduction (and encasement) into them of spiritual power drawn from the worlds above through their आकर्षणशक्ति made use of the most sacred Vedic and Agamic formulas and methods. These same sacred authorities also regulate the worship carried on in the temples, and they—and not human whims or emotions— are responsible for the existing prohibition of Chandalas, Mlecchas and outcastes from entering the holy precincts. Mrs. Besant's unenlightened views of Hinduism—which are full of absurd and thoughtless errors, as we shall show presently here in regard to the examples she adduces—may be regarded as Gospel truth by her blind Theosophic worshippers, but those who believe in the Vedas and Agamas must continue to disregard her blandishments and turn a deaf ear to her siren voice. No mere rules of logic, or fervid appeals to emotion, can avail against the injunctions of the Vedas and Agamas, and Mrs Besant will have to lead the frantic and furious popular forces of an unthinking and brutal revolutionary mob to overthrow the British Indian state and constitution before she or those for whom she speaks can enter the inner Holy of Holies of our temples which enjoy the protection guaranteed to them by our wise rulers.

***

The examples of Sri Rama and Sri Krishna adduced by Mrs. Besant in this connection have absolutely no bearing on the present topic, and only show how innocent she still is of a knowledge of some even of the elementary principles and truths of our religion. The *deeds* of Avataras of the Supreme Being cannot *always* be made intelligible to our limited vision by the application of the known laws of our Codes of Dharma. No doubt one of the purposes of the coming of an Avatara is धर्मसंस्थापना "the establishment of Dharma." But an Avatara has also a special mission on earth. The appearance of an Avatara is invariably preceded by a special request of the Devas in Heaven (Brahma-loka), and is intended to serve a special purpose. While on earth, also, Avataras do not lose altogether their character as the Supreme Being, and some of their undertakings are such that their true inner significance can only be intelligible to the enlightened and perfected understandings of the Rishis and Yogis. It is this aspect of the question that the blessed Bhagavan has in view when he says:

जन्म कर्म च मे दिव्यमेवं यो वेत्ति तत्त्वतः ॥
त्यक्त्वा देहं पुनर्जन्म नैति मामेति सोऽर्जुन ॥

"Whoever truly knows thus my divine incarnation and actions, having cast off his body, is not born again, and attains to me, O Arjuna."

***

Mrs. Besant's case of the "flower-girl of

the market-place" is a very apt one for illustrating this truth. If she will only acquaint herself with the account in the Bhagavata of the blessed Bhagavan's subsequent intercourse with the flower-girl, she cannot fail to see what a folly it will be for us to suppose that we are here to follow in all cases the example of the life-history of these Avataras. We know, indeed, that Mrs. Besant is thought by some of her followers to be an Avatara herself and perhaps that accounts for her holding up Sri Krishna's dealings with the flower-girl of the market-place" as an example to us all to follow. We can, of course, leave her to her own views and ways, but we ought not to fail in our duty of warning our readers against the absurdity of supposing that they are all Avataras, and that they can set at nought the principles and rules of Dharma. We, common folk, should still carefully guide ourselves according to Dharma— not only lest we, by failure to do so, lose our soul, but also because we might thereby get at times into difficulties with the magistracy and find ourselves inmates, however unwillingly, of those institutions which Government mercifully maintains in order to reform the criminal class in the land.

***

Many have indulged in extravagant laudation of the liberalising effect of modern studies in our schools and colleges and under the guidance of our famous University. It is only time, not abstract reasoning, that can test the inner value and worth of men and institutions. The critical hour has come, and the gospel of disunion and hatred is being preached everywhere. Hence we find many of our educated men coming forward to show to what giddy heights they can climb, with the aid which modern education has given them in the ascent towards wise moderation and enlightened tolerance. Mr. P.M. Anandan, B.A. L.T. is the last to claim recognition. He spoke as follows at the Cochin Ezhava Samajam: "Spend more for the creation of more temples, and the proceeds are to be employed not in feeding of cursed Brahmins." No educated Brahmin of today has come forward to demand the feeding of Brahmins. Mr. Anandan is also, quite within his rights in insisting that his community should not provide for the feeding of Brahmins in temples, old or new. But where is the wisdom or need of speaking of "cursed Brahmins" before a public assemblage of his countrymen. If such cursing in public is an honourable or efficient method of gaining public ends or honor for one's self, Mr. Anandan is quite welcome to please himself, but we would like to remind him that neither Sri Narayana Guruswami, the holy Guru of his community, nor the religion which, we believe, Mr. Anandan still professes, nor the modern education he has gained, of which his double degree is the outward symbol, will justify the manner in which he has chosen to speak of the Brahmins. Having resided five years at Tellicherry amid the Ezhavas and Tiyyas and had numerous students and friends among them, the present writer cannot but feel surprised that the unsettlement caused by the gospel of discord preached within these twelve months should have spread even to the industrious and well-bred and quiet people belonging to Ezhava and Tiyya communities of the West, and that even a gentleman like Mr. Anandan, with his high modern education and double degree, should descend so far as to suppose that violent imprecation and loud-mouthed malevolence are methods worthy of being adopted by honourable public men.

***

It is strange that a man of such fine discrimination as Mr. S. S. Setlur should have succumbed (vide *New India*, December 29, 1917) to the idea that the *Ramayana* of Valmiki is a record of the penetration, by peaceful or warlike methods, of Aryan civilisation into the Southern Peninsula of India and of the flight of the Dravidians, East and South, before the Aryan advance. He speaks of "the high civilisation of the enemies of the Aryans," and "Ravana's civilisation," as expressions of almost identical significance. Evidently Mr. Setlur has finally adopted as correct the theory that Ravana was the one Dravidian ruler

who opposed the advance of Aryan colonisation and civilisation. These Ideas are not in the least supported by the facts stated in the Epic. Indeed Valmiki's work cannot stand the strain of the theory which holds that the Vanaras were the Dravidian allies, and the Rakshasas the Dravidian enemies of Sri Rama, the Aryan invader or colonist from the North. For the kingdoms of Chola, Pandya, and Kerala existed at the time of Ramas's appearance in South India, but do not seem to have attracted his notice at all, although in his helpless position he might have well sought their aid. The Vanaras whose king, Sugriva, rendered Rama the aid he wanted and who fought for Rama against Ravana are said to have inhabited only the hill country in the South-west of India, but they were also summoned to his standard by Sugriva not only from the hill of Kishkindha, but also from the hills all over India and beyond Himalayas and even from the hills within region of the orb of the Sun. Hence, the Vanaras cannot, from the Ramayana, be proved to have been Dravidians at all. As for Ravana and his people, Lanka is not Ceylon which has always been known as Simhala (*Cingala*, in Tamil) to the Hindus, and it is not at all certain whether Ravana and his people of Lanka were Dravidians, and if Rama had no occasion to deal with any of the Dravidian kings or people of Chola, Pandya, and Kerala, how can the *Ramayana* get itself connected with the repelling or conquest of the Dravidians by the Aryans?

## Dharma—II.

(By K. G. NATESA SASTRI, Vaidya Visarad.)

In our last article we referred to Dharma as being the mandate contained in the Vedas. Let us now examine this view at some length and try to understand it clearly. According to Jaimini, Dharma is 'चोदनालक्षणोऽर्थः'; this means that Dharma is the "*injunction contained in the Vedas that can produce bliss*" The Saintly Sabaraswamin explains the word 'अर्थ' in the Sutra as that which produces bliss or श्रेयस्. This naturally leads us to ask why should such a definition be given of Dharma. If Jaimini realy wanted to confine Dharma to the Vedas alone he could have defined it as 'चोदनालक्षणो धर्मः'. If, on the other hand, he wished to define Dharma as that which produces Bliss he could have defined it as 'अर्थो धर्मः'. Why should a mixture of the two be made. To this objection the venerable Sabaraswami replies that the word "*Dharma*" is understood in the Sanskrit world in a *technical sense*. Says he 'यो हि यागमनुतिष्ठति तं धार्मिक इति समाचक्षते; यश्च यस्य कर्ता स तेन व्यपदिश्यते;... तेन यः पुरुषं निःश्रेयसेन युनक्ति स धर्मशब्देनोच्यते'. This means "The world understands one who performs याग etc., as a Dharmika. One is defined by the action he does. Hence we have to understand that Dharma is that action which produces Bliss." Since people understand याग etc., to be Dharma, it is now too late to question the sense attached to that word, but we must submit and take it silently to be such. It is only from the Vedas that we can hope to know that याग etc., produces Bliss. Hence it is that Jaimini defines Dharma as 'चोदनालक्षणोऽर्थः'. Now as regards the validity of the technical sense we beg pardon of our readers for quoting the opinion of an eminent and authoritative Judge. Says Maxwell in his 'Interpretation of the Statutes'—"The first and foremost elementary rule of construction is that it is to be assumed that words and phrases are used in their technical meaning if they have acquired one and in their popular meaning if they have not, and that phrases and sentences are to be construed according to the rules of grammar; and from this presumption it is not allowable to depart, etc.". Exactly the same view is maintained by the venerable Sabaraswami when he says 'लोके येष्वर्थेषु प्रसिद्धानि पदानि, तानि सति संभवे तदर्थान्येव सूत्रेष्वित्यवगन्तव्यम्। नाध्याहारादिभिरेषां परिकल्पनीयोऽर्थः, परिभाषितव्यो वा'. When, therefore, Sabaraswami says that the word धर्म is understood by the people as being "Yaga" etc., we have no right to attribute some other meaning to that word and evolve our own cherished views. In this connection we wish to clearly point out that nobody is debarred from using the word Dharma in any sense he likes. It will, then, become only a conventional word deliberately used to denote a particular cherished view.

The ancient Buddhists used that word in a sense peculiar to themselves. So did the Jainas, So did the Sankhyas. So do the present-day Theosophists. We have no quarrel with them. What we mean is that these several meanings, quite opposed to one another, cannot constitute either the technical meaning, or the popular meaning, of the word *Dharma*. A popular meaning is that which the people understand, without any effort, on the mere hearing of the word. That is what the Sage Sabara means when he says 'येष्वर्थेषु प्रसिद्धानि पदानि'. That is what Maxwell means in the passage quoted above ("Maxwell 4th. Edition page 3"). If anybody is pleased to use the word according as he pleases, let him by all means do that; but let him not, *for Truth's sake*, maintain dogmatically that his own explanation is the real one according to the Sastras. Jaimini and Badarayana lived at a time when the Vedic religion was in its full swing, and when they say that a particular word is understood by the public in a particular sense is it not sheer nonsense to deny that and put our own construction, when we live at a time removed far, far, away from the sublime Vedic age. When, therefore, Mr. S. A. Vaneswar says '*In so far then as Dharma embodies and consecrates Truth etc.*' (Hindu Message Vol. I, No. 6) he seems to take shelter under vague terms by not explaining what *is Truth* and what are the *right instruments of knowing or judging it*. The followers of the Vedic religion maintain that what is contained in the Vedas is *Truth*. Theosophists maintain something else as such although they declare that their view alone is the Vedic Truth. There are the followers of "Arya Samaj", of "Brahma Samaj", of Bradlaugh, of Ingersoll, of Herbert Spencer, etc., etc. Everybody maintains his own views as *Truth*. The idea of *Right* and *Wrong* varies among men, nay even among the nations, in proportion to the evolution of the mind, surroundings etc., that contribute not a little to the growth or otherwise of a man or a nation. We say this advisedly, for, in India the surroundings etc., contributed to the downfall, which is *now* going on at a highly accelerated velocity, whereas in the West it helped growth and development, though not perfect at present. But of this we shall speak on another occasion. Let us turn to our topic.

## The Personality of the Gods.

(BY S. MAHALINGA AIYAR B.A., B.L.)

I propose in this article to develop an argument justifying the belief in the personality of the gods. The Hindus believe in a Supreme Being, as well as in numerous other Beings, called Devas, endowed with intelligence and consciousness, and controlling every happening in the universe. The Veda says about the stars, 'सुकृतां वा एतानि ज्योतींषि यन्नक्षत्राणि ।' "These shining stars are the splendours of the (departed souls of the) Virtuous." The Bhagavad Gita teaches that Devas should be nourished by sacrifices by men, on whom in return, they will shower their blessings. (III—11). The Gita also says यज्ञात् भवति पर्जन्यो *i.e.*, rain is caused by sacrifice. But a scientist will tell us that rain is produced by natural causes, and that, "no act of prayer or sacrifice can cancel one shower from heaven or deflect towards us a single beam of the sun."

The extreme materialistic view of the Universe, which declared in the seventies of the last century that "the atoms combine in obedience to mechanical laws, and not only organic forms but the phenomena of sensation and thought are the result of their combination," or, more crisply put, "as bile is a secretion of the liver, sensation and thought are the secretions of the mind," is no longer held by the leading scientists and philosophers of to-day. But the modern man, somehow, thinks it "unscientific" to believe in the control and guidance of the universe by an Intelligent Being, with other intelligent beings under Him, who are endowed with consciousness and will like men, but belong to an order superior to mankind. Is it really unscientific? Let us examine the matter a little.

Man is said to represent the highest type of sentient being on this Earth. Man is endowed with Intelligence and will, and he never acts without a design and a purpose. Is it irrational to hold that there may be higher beings, who are also self-conscious and intelligent but who are as far above the highest man, as man is above the lowest

animal? The essence of mind is design and purpose. How can design or purpose be denied in the universe, when man has these attributes? "Is it not more reasonable to say," Sir Oliver Lodge asks, "just as we are conscious of the power of guidance in ourselves, so guidance and intelligent control may be an element running through the universe and may be incorporated even in material things?" He uses a parable. A traveller who has lost his way in a mountain district coming across a path may rejoice, saying "This will lead me to some human habitation." The materialist, if he were consistent, should say, "The path is merely earth's surface marked by the absence of grass or the wearing down of stones. How can it guide me to my destination?" But a man of common sense sees something more. He thinks that human beings must have caused its formation, and so it would lead to a human habitation. The materialist is welcome to think, "This cannot be a place inhabited by as high an order of beings as myself. There cannot be living creatures here at all; or, at best sheep and insects inhabit this place. The path should have been self-made." But the man with greater humility, is ready to assume, though he does not see, that the place is inhabited by human beings.

To take another illustration. Suppose a man sees at a great distance a big moving thing which he cannot distinctly make out to be an animal or a machine. It is open to him to take either of two views. He may regard it to be an automaton motor car, not kept in its course by any intelligent agency, and rushing aimlessly to no desired destination. But another view is possible. He may think that it must be either a living creature having will and intelligence; or a mechanism with an intelligent driver, who is driving it to his intended destination; because his experience of all moving objects, about which he has direct and immediate knowledge, shows that such moving objects are all either living beings, or non-living things kept in motion by intelligent beings. Similary one may regard the sun as an automaton moving globe; or he may believe that what we call the sun is only the outer body of a divine self-conscious Being who keeps his regular course with a will and a purpose. The latter view can by no means be called irrational. It is a narrow philosophy indeed which would confine the exhibition of design and purpose to the activities of men and animals only, but would regard Nature's activities as mechanical, aimless, and chaotic. To believe in the personality of the Sun, the Moon or the Earth is not certainly irrational or unscientific. What the physical sciences have established or can hope to establish does not in any way exclude the possibility of a directing and controlling agency in cases where human intervention is apparently absent. The Laws of physical science are formulated on the hypothesis that the forces of Nature are allowed unrestricted and unaided play. But that method is simply an abstraction necessitated by the conditions. The Laws formulated from the experiments performed in a laboratory are so stated as if the things selected themselves and interacted among themselves without the intervention of intelligent agency. We don't say "If Professor so and so pours dilute hydrochloric acid on chalk, carbonic acid gas is liberated," but simply, "Carbon dioxide is evolved if hydrochloric acid is poured on chalk." Yet the experiment in the laboratory is always performed by a human being having will and emotion. He selects the things, determines the sequence of events to produce a predetermined effect with the purpose of teaching his class. What then, in the grander laboratory of Nature? All the phenomena that happen there, the thunder or the lightning, the formation of the stars or the motion of the planets, may be "explained" by science. But how can or do those explanations negative the possibility of a Being or beings bringing together in juxtaposition the things and conditions so as to cause those phenomena, or their doing so at a particular time or place and with a particular purpose? "Life or mind can neither generate matter, nor even directly exert force. Yet it can cause matter to exert force on matter, and so can exercise guidance and control. It can so prepare any scene of activity by

arranging the position of existing material and timing the liberation of existing energy, as to produce results concordant with an idea or scheme or intention." (Sir Oliver Lodge)

If once it is admitted that Evolution has a purpose and an end towards which it is working, then the reasoning of Sri Sankaracharya is irresistible.

'नाचेतनं लोके चेतनानधिष्ठितं स्वतन्त्रं किंचित् विशिष्टपुरुषार्थनिर्वर्तनसमर्थान् विकारान् विरचयद्दृष्टम् । न मृदादयो रथादयो वा स्वयमचेतनाः सन्तः चेतनैः कुलालादिभिः अश्वादिभिर्वा अनधिष्ठिताः विशिष्टकार्याभिमुखप्रवृत्तयो दृश्यन्ते । दृष्टाच्चादृष्टसिद्धिः । अतः प्रवृत्त्यनुपपत्तेरपि हेतोः नाचेतनम् जगत्कारणमनुमातव्यम् भवति ।

"A non-intelligent thing, which, without being guided by an intelligent being spontaneously and in an orderly manner produces effects capable of subserving the purposes of some particular person, is nowhere observed in the world. We observe that things like clay or a chariot—which are in their own nature non-intelligent—enter on activities tending towards particular effects, when they are acted upon by intelligent beings such as potters in the one case, and by horses in the other. From what is seen we determine what is not seen. Hence a non-intelligent cause of the universe cannot be inferred, because, on that hypothesis, the activity without which the world cannot be produced, would be impossible.

The absence of caprice in the working of the Laws of Nature cannot justify the denial of Will and guidance in the phenomena of the material world. A rustic watching a railway train passing by his field every day at a particular hour may think that the time of its passing is unalterably fixed. Yet the Traffic manager can change the time-table of his own accord; or in response to an appeal from the public. The fixity of laws is no ground for presuming the absence of a law-maker. An illiterate man in an out-of-the-way village may think that the laws of his country are unchangeable, and to his untutored mind the Tashildar or the Police Inspector may seem to belong as much to the natural order of things as the sun or the moon, and he may be perfectly unaware of the existence of a law-making sovereign or Legislature. Suppose the rustic is conceited, and wants to see a change in the law when he asks for it just for satisfying himself as to the existence of the law-maker, would it be possible to satisfy his caprice?

We know that a machine cannot work if its parts are frequently or perpetually shifted. If the Sun keeps its regular course, we need not therefore conclude that it moves in obedience to an unalterable mechanical law. The head of an office fixes a time for beginning work every day, and himself attends, and enforces attendance on the part of his subordinates, at the appointed time. Why? For the sake of convenience and orderliness. Evolution must be orderly *i.e.*, it must be regular. Regularity involves repetition in a certain fixed fashion. Intelligences who control Nature and Nature's Laws, keep them fixed and regular for ensuring ordely evolution.

In ancient times, the essential of kingship was taken to be that the king could do what he liked. Caprice was held to be a necessary adjunct of power. But we now recognise that a sovereign's obedience to a law made by himself does not derogate from his sovereignty. Is Evolution to be obstructed or disturbed every now and then to satisfy the curiosity of a school-taught materialist? A child may wish to obtain control of a machine, just to have the freedom and pleasure of taking out its parts and meddling with it. But the owner of the machine may not allow the child to interfere with it. The child may become an apprentice when grown up, approach the machine and handle its parts; and may become foreman and even proprietor. But then, when he has become the foreman or proprietor, would he disturb or obstruct the working of the machine just for the sake of satisfying the curiosity of an inquisitive child or a meddlesome visitor?

Man can get control over matter when no harm would result therefrom. Powers which give control over matter can be acquired by Yoga. But the Yogi is one who has conquered his senses and his mind

and so the powers he has acquired would be used only in furtherence of evolution and not in obstruction to it.

Even as in a human body there are the mind, the sensory organs, innumerable cells having individual lives, and lastly hairs and nails having no sensation or feeling, so also the whole Universe is God, the Virat-Purusha. The gods and human beings may be likened to the innumerable living cells in the human body. The inanimate material world may be likened to the nail and hair portion of Brahman. Science has made us familiar with the idea of motion within motion, and physiology with the idea of life within life. There is one All-pervading life and All-powerful Energy, within which all beings have their lives and all energies their play. As A. R. Wallace in his book "The World of Life" says:—"the absolute necessity of a creative and directive power and mind, is exemplified in the wonderful phenomena of growth, of organisation, and fundamentally of cell-structure and of life itself; ......There are now in the universe infinite grades of power, infinite grades of knowledge and wisdom, infinite grades of influence of higher beings upon lower..............This vast and wonderful universe with its almost infinite variety of forms, motions, and reactions of part upon part, from suns and systems up to plant life, animal life and the human living soul, has ever required and still requires the continuous co-ordinated agency of myriads of such intelligences."

---

## Andal's Tiruppavai.

(By V. Bhashyam Iyengar, B.A., B.L.)

Andal is the only woman-saint of the Vaishnavas and holds a very distinguished place among the eminent personages who have been canonised as saints and are revered and worshipped by them. She was the spiritual child of all the Alwars but excelled them in divine love and ecstacy, and it was from her that Ramanuja chiefly drew his inspiration. Her teaching is the core of Vaishnavism and she holds the most affectionate corner of the Vaishnava's heart.

The tradition is that she was an incarnation of Bhu Devi, one of the three consorts of the Lord Narayana. It is written that she was not born but appeared as a child in a flower-garden at Srivilliputtur on Tuesday, the fourth day of the bright fortnight, in the month of Adi of the year Nala, the ninety eighth year from the beginning of this Kali Yuga. Vishnu Chitta, better known as Peri Alwar, who was keeping the garden to serve and worship Vada Perum Koyil Udayan, the local diety, with the flowers thereof, found her and brought her up affectionately as his own child. She was a very precocious child. Very early in life she exhibited signs of an exuberant and all-consuming love of the Lord and disgust at worldly happiness and pleasure. She considered that the Lord was here and she was of the Lord and her one blazing desire was to attain Him and lay herself completely at His gracious feet for His service and enjoyment. While yet a child she was known to have coquettishly worn the flower wreaths and garlands which her father would in all innocence subsequently take to the Lord and adorn Him with. Did she not love the Lord or was she not His beloved? Her father found out the practice one day and rebuked her, in the shallowness of his knowledge regarding his child's godliness, but the Lord appeared in his dream and spoke "The flowers acquire their fragrance for me, only by their contact with my beloved. Let me have the usual wreaths and garlands." After this incident, Andal became known as Soodi Kodutha Nachiar, the queen who (first) wore (the flower garland) and (then) gave (it to the Lord).

Her knowledge and her love grew with her years. The tender creeper stretched itself in search of the stately tree to support itself and hold it in its fond embrace. She longed for union with the Lord. How beautiful and true is the idea that the Lord is the only Purusha and all the rest are his spouses. No other relationship but that of the ideal wife and the ideal husband can express even faintly the connection between the Chit or individual soul and Iswara or the Lord. Other relationships

are all limited but the relationship of wife and husband is unlimited, as observed by Sita, the heroine of Ramayana:

मितं ददाति हि पिता मितं माता मितं सुतः ।
अमितस्य हि दातारं भर्तारं का न पूजयेत् ॥

The ideal wife willingly and gladly places herself at the complete disposal of her ideal husband, relies on him as the sole protector and knows no other refuge, centres her affection and pleasure in him, bears herself up in his company and would not suffer even a moment of separation and is saved and redeemed by him and him only. These characteristics distinguish also the soul and lead when recognised and realised in practice, to its eternal and indissoluble union with the Lord. This is the only road to salvation; the other lanes and by-paths simply lead thereunto. That is why the Rishis of Dandakaranya prayed for birth as gopis and why the leading Alwars of Southern India often mentally transformed themselves into women to better approach the Lord by the path of love and devotion.

Andal had obviously no need to undergo an artificial transformation. She *was* a woman. When she grew to be a girl of the marriageable age, her father was in the face of a heavy responsibility as he had to find a suitable match for her but she scorned union with any man and would not hear of a match with any but the Purushottama to whom she had already consecrated her life—a resolve which finds free expression in her melting poem of Nachiar Tiru mozhi. Tradition proceeds to say, that her father then described the several deities presiding over the hundred and eight sacred places of this land, that when the Lord of Srirangam was being sung she completely lost her heart and in an ecstatic condition with joyous tears trickling down her breast she cried out to Him to come and have her and forgot herself in dreaming and continuing to dream of her union with Him, that, thereupon, her father who received a call in his vision from the Lord of Sri Rangam to present his daughter to Him took her to His temple clad in marital clothes and auspiciously decked with ornaments and flower-garlands befitting the occasion, and that when she was in the presence of the Lord to whom her heart had been calling forth without intermission, she boldly went up his Serpent Couch and clasped Him in her most affectionate embrace and was no more seen by the large crowds who had gathered round to witness the scene and worship her even in preference to Him.

*(To be continued)*

---

## Correspondence.

*The views of our contributors and correspondents do not necessarily reflect the policy of this Review—Ed.*

---

### A Reply to Mr. N. K. Venkatesa Iyer.

In his criticism of Swami Vivekananda's lectures on *Gnana Yoga* and my lectures on the *Gita* published in 'The Hindu Message,' Mr. N. K. Venkatesa Iyer has erred by misstatement and overstatement. His contemptuous reference to Swami Vivekananda's "limitations of life" needs no remarks at my hands. The Swamiji's greatness will not be affected in the least by such challenges by such men. But I want to make *my* ideas clear to my critic. He thinks that Karma Yoga, Bhakti Yoga, and Gnana Yoga represent only one path, but the unfortunate feature about his critical note is that his ideas are not clear to himself and are hence not clear to others either. He says that there is only one path to salvation and that is the practice of Dharma. But all this, though true so far as it goes, errs by the non-realisation of the fact that there is a hierarchy of values among the different elements of the all-comprehensive word *Dharma*. Even eating and marrying come within *Dharma* while it is said that God-realisation is the highest Dharma.

अयं हि परमो धर्मः यद्योगेनात्मदर्शनम् ।

In Chapter 12 of the Gita the Lord himself points out the various rungs in the golden ladder of the higher life that I have referred to in my lectures on the Gita.

I must take special and strong exception to Mr. N. K. Venkatesa Iyer's unwarranted and ridiculous statement that "Mr. Sastri indicates in his exposition an idea which has

become rather unpleasantly familiar to us through the Theosophical Society, for it has produced the greatest possible mischief in all fields of our activity, religious, social, and political, the idea, *viz.*, that one of these *mârgas* might have been passed over by a person in his previous births and that therefore he may feel himself competent for a so-called higher path in this life." This is a perversion of what I have stated. I have made it quite clear that a man's Dharma is determined by his *Varna* and *asrama*. There may however be cases of men who had attained God-love and God-realisation in previous births and who get this birth as the result of *prarabdha karma* and there may be other cases of men who in the course of this birth attain God-realisation and yet continue to do the duty that their birth and station in life make it incumbent on them to do I never meant to say that a man who feels himself fit for a higher path can throw off all his duties which he must perform by reason of his birth and station in life and thus bring out a confusion of duties and functions and subvert social and moral order. I was stating the pre-requisites of liberation in my articles criticised by Mr. Venkatesa Iyer and I pointed out that a man's attainment of liberation is the result of the highest devotion and self-knowledge whether these had been acquired in previous births or are acquired in this birth. His actual work in life is not determined by these, because what has work in the world of phenomena to do with the glory of the noumenon? His work is determined by his *Varna* and *asrama* (birth and station in life). If my critic does not accept this well-known doctrine, he must deny liberation to Suka and Jadabharata and our great *Alwars* and *Nayanmars*.

My critic says that "Purva-janma-samskara......has absolutely nothing to do with our *practical* conduct of life in this world." He then proceeds to describe in a passage full of strange and fantastic theosophical mysticism the manner in which our actions paint our souls on the canvas of eternity; and he says that the process is unconscious and that we can see the shape of the souls if we have a third eye. Then by a curious feat of logic he says that "the figures we make of our souls on the canvas of Eternity will be seen not by us but by the world in which we live." Perhaps the world is fully dowered with the third eye!! Then he says: "Ours is the performance of Dharma or Duty and the world's is the fruit thereof." He finally winds up his criticism by a reference to the "artificial mirror of God." I forbear from commenting on all this because a great deal of exposition by my critic seems to be necessary to enable us to realise the connectedness and truth of these ideas and because they do not bear upon my ideas as criticised by Mr. Venkatesa Iyer. I know him and have the highest regard for his veneration for and adherence to the *shastraic* life but I am afraid that in this instance he has erred very much in his comprehension of my views and in his statement of Sri Krishna's declaration of *Sadhanas* in the Bhagavad-Gita.

K. S. RAMASWAMY SASTRY

## Voice of India.

### Home Rule in Medicine.

I

The fiat has gone forth that each country is competent to rule its own destiny untrammelled by tedious minority under an elderly nation. Whether the world will accept this fiat or whether there will eventually in the near future be "a parliament of nations and a federation of man," is a very large issue on which we are not much interested at least just at present. But we in India keenly feel it incumbent upon ourselves to impress upon the minds of our people and rulers the paramount necessity for real home rule in matters medical. That India as a country with its vast and varied resources and equally varied climates is quite competent to be self-contained in materiæ medicæ is easy of comprehension. Nor are brains and talents wanting to make the thing a success. What then is it that prevents the dreams from being realized facts:

The things of all things that prevents India from supplying her own medical and surgical needs is the fact that the hands to do it and the brain to will it and the heart to beat for it—these are not ours. If we had the control of the purse and the management of our affairs, we would forthwith compile from time to time a Pharmacopicea Indica, we will subsidise and encourage the establishment of Pharmaceutical, Chemical and Analytical laboratories, we would set up factories for the preparation of aseptic surgical dressings, aseptic furniture instruments and appliances—and thereby exploit the mineral, the vegetable and labour resources of this country. Such industries will keep millions in India and will find outlet and use for millions in India and will change the face of the country.

Is it too much to expect of our leaders in the medical profession to take up this question? It involves no question of colour and creed while it is likely to benefit one and all. If we are granted home rule in matters medical, that need not and does not

necessarily mean the sweeping away of all I. M. S. men: we need them; we need more of them to give us the guiding hand of fellowship. We would in that case find employment for a very large number of our idle educated youths and he is a short-sighted time-server who sees in our claims for home rule the disappearance of his countrymen's claims on our gratitude. The Indian of all the peoples on earth always says—"Live and let live." He is never intolerant of a brother near his throne. Those Englishmen who have made the Western system of treatment what it is today, should have the robust manliness to see an Indian work side by side with them— and not snarl at the prospect. Men eminent in science and culture, men whose claims upon our money and our gratitude are broad-based on their strong personality should never be afraid of us. A Norman Chevers, a Sir Henry Lukis, a Sir Havelock Charles, a Sir Leonard Rogers, a George King, a David Prain, a Hooper, a Roxburgh, an Alcock—will never fight shy of colour, creed or caste. It is the third rate men who are foisted on us, who have no claims to our special gratitude—it is they that raise the cry of "Murder" when home rule is talked of. All the same we feel that we should claim it and that we should get it and that it is our best ambition to see India self-contained in matters medical. We commend the above to the notice of The Rt. Hon. Mr. Samuel Montagu, the Secretary of State for India.

*Indian Medical Record, November 1917.*

II.

If we again advert to the same subject, it is because its importance deserves it. We trust the title of this article will not prove a red rag to the few John Bulls now living in India. We do not want to take the bread out of their mouth; we do not want at once to supplant them ; but we do want that they should now cultivate the spirit of "live and let live." The splendid services that a vast army of I. M. S. and R. A. M. C. men have rendered to the cause of Indian and even Tropical medicine cannot be forgotten : the names of those men will be written in letters of gold in the annals of Indian medicine ; but there is no gainsaying the fact that now-a-days, giants are getting fewer even among I. M. S. and R. A. M. C. men—and that in spite of modern facilities.

The time has, therefore, come when the elder brother of I. M. S. should take the younger brother of a dusky practitioner in India by the hand and lead him onwards to progress. For, it is no gainsaying here too that both Western medical education and Western means and methods of treatment fall very lamentably short of the standards practised in Europe and America. It will no longer be for the service men to give what it pleases them to give nor will it bode any good to the country were its practitioners passive recipients of doles. The fault is ours if we do not wake up and rub our eyes and take stock of the means and methods unfolded before our gaze in the Western world. The remedy must therefore come from ourselves.

Such as they are, Indian practitioners ( and we always refer to qualified men ) are torn by jealousy of each other and are short-sighted. The Indian Medical Registration Acts have not welded them into an organic whole as it should have done. A sense of self-preservation ought at once to fuse them all into one body with mind—just as the Congress or the Moslem League have been. Unity then is the first desideratum and if it is impossible to include the service men (assistant and sub-assistant surgeons) in this union at first, it would not matter ; we can trust to time to do that for us.

Having united in sentiment, our next duty will be to put our houses in repair. That we can do by close personal association with the real Ayurvedic Kavirajes and Unani practitioners. The Medical Registration Acts must be so altered as to allow us to identify our interests with those of the Kavirajes. Along with the Kavirajes on the one hand and allopathic practitioners imported from the West on the other, we can build up a materia medica suited to this country.

Having drawn up a Pharmacopicea, we must next approach men with money to help us start materia medica, gardening and pharmaceutical works and laboratories. When these are fait accompli, we would need hospitals and clinics of our own. Then will come the time when I. M. S. and R. A. M. C. men who have till now gathered the rich harvest of practice and experience at our expense should make us partners in the toil and with the sympathetic hand of a real *Guru* should lead us on, and on, till we remain spoon-fed babies no longer. Then will begin home rule in medicine, then will India be medically a self-contained and self-sufficient unit and may have enough to spare probably for the world's consumption. The picture we draw is by no means roseate or overdrawn.

But, for the realization of this goal, much sacrifice, much uphill work will have to be done. Each practitioner from every nook and corner must flock to a common standard and help to form an All India Medical Society. The days of *tamasha* or show, of glitter and glamour, of veiled attempt at cheap advertisement by holding meteoric conferences and such likes, are over. The time has come for action, for self-effacement, for self-negation in the best interests of the profession. He best serves his country who can completely wipe out his own selfishness. In these coster-monger days and days of luxury we can understand each private practitioner likes to be let alone to make his pile ; and that specially so in a country such as ours is—where a large army of state-paid medical men are let loose to compete among private practitioners who have nothing else to fall back upon than sheer merit. But whatever the difficulties, their volume should steel us against the difficulties and make us forego our present comfortable berths so that our posterity may live in ease and peace. We again call upon our countrymen to unite without delay to form a solid, sound and single corporate body with one mind and one body.

*Indian Medical Record, December 1917.*

THE HINDU MESSAGE will be posted regularly every week to any address in India, Burma and Ceylon on payment of Rs. 6 only per annum ; For all foreign countries within the Postal Union it will be despatched on payment of 10s. 6d. per annum. All subscriptions are payable in advance and should be remitted to the Manager. "*The Hindu Message*", **Srirangam.**

***Printed and Published by T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A. at the Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.***